

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/478,668 01/06/00 BANNON

G HS-102-DIV

HM12/0731

PATREA L PABST ESQ
ARNALL GOLDEN & GREGORY LLP
2800 ONE ATLANTIC CENTER
1201 WEST PEACHTREE STREET
ATLANTA GA 30309-3450

EXAMINER

DECLoux, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

10

DATE MAILED:

07/31/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/478,668

Applicant(s)

Bannon et al

Examiner

DeCloux, Amy

Group Art Unit
1644



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 6, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 14-36 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 14-36 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☒ *Notice to Comply with Requirements for Sequence Disclosures*

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825 because there is no submission of a Sequence Listing. The applicants are required to either submit a new CRF and Sequence Listing or a letter authorizing the use of the sequence listing filed with the prior application 09/141,220, along with a statement that the sequences in the two cases are identical.

37 C.F.R. 1.821 (e) A copy of the "Sequence Listing" referred to in paragraph © of this section must also be submitted in computer readable form in accordance with the requirements of § 1.824. The computer readable form is a copy of the "Sequence Listing" and will not necessarily be retained as part of the patent application file. **If the computer readable form of a new application is to be identical with the computer readable form of another application of the applicant on file in the Office, reference may be made to the other application and computer readable form in lieu of filing a duplicate computer readable form in the new application. The new application shall be accompanied by a letter making such reference to the other application and computer readable form, both of which shall be completely identified.**

(f) In addition to the paper copy required by paragraph © of this section and the computer readable form required by paragraph (e) of this section, a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same must be submitted with the computer readable form. Such a statement must be a verified statement if made by a person not registered to practice before the Office.

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 CFR121:

Group I, claims 14-29, drawn to a modified allergen, classified in class 530, subclass 370,

Group II, claims 30-31, drawn to a nucleotide molecule encoding a modified allergen and a vector for its expression, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1 and class 435, subclass 320.1,

Group III, claim 32, drawn to a nucleotide molecule for causing a site specific mutation, classified in class 536, subclass 24.33,

Group IV, claim 33, drawn to a transgenic plant, classified in class 800, subclass 278,

Group V, claim 34, drawn to a transgenic animal, classified in class 800, subclass 13,

Group VI, claim 35, drawn to a compound which binds to an IgE binding site of an allergen, classified in class 530, subclass 350, or

Group VII, claim 36, drawn to a method of treatment, classified in class 424, subclass 275.1.

3. Groups I and VII are related as a product and process of use. The inventions

can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the modified allergen can be used to produce antibodies.

4. Groups I-VI are different products. They differ with respect to their physicochemical properties and are therefore patentably distinct. Groups II and III both encompass a nucleotide, however these nucleotides are distinct with different coding properties. Therefore Groups I-VI are patentably distinct.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and because a search of the non patent literature of any of these distinct inventions would not be co-extensive with a search of the others, an examination and search of two or more inventions in a single application would constitute a serious undue burden on the Examiner, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. If Group I is elected, the applicant is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to
A) elect a **specific adjuvant**, such as one recited in claim 24, and
B) elect a **specific allergen**, such as one recited in claims 28-29,

7. Applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a specific species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The response must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

8. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

9. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35

U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

10. Claims 24, 28 and 29 are generic.
11. The species are distinct each from the other for the following reasons:
 - A) the allergens differ biochemically and have distinct structures
 - B) the adjuvants are different biochemically and have distinct structures.
12. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
13. A telephone call to request an oral election was not made due to the complexity of the restriction and the requirement to comply with sequence rules.
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy DeCloux whose telephone number is (703) 306-5821. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Please Note: In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1640 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is 703-308-4315. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this Pilot Program. If you have any questions or suggestions, please contact Paula Hutzell, Supervisory Patent Examiner at paula.hutzell@uspto.gov or 703-308-4310. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

Amy DeCloux, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner,
Group 1640, Technology Center 1600
July 28, 2000

PHILIP GIMBEL
PRIMARY
PHILIP GIMBEL
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1640
TECH CENTER 1600
7/28/00

**NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING
NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES**

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.
- ☐ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☒ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other:.

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216

For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212

PatentIn Software Program Support (SIRA)

Technical Assistance.....703-287-0200

To Purchase PatentIn Software.....703-306-2600

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE